



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/340,771	06/28/1999	DAVID LEWIS MYERS	13944	4334

7590 04/09/2002

DOUGLAS H TULLEY JR  
KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE INC  
401 NORTH LAKE STREET  
NEENAH, WI 54956

EXAMINER

PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/340,771	MYERS, DAVID LEWIS	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christopher C. Pratt	1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher C. Pratt. (3) David Myers.

(2) Christos Kyriakou. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 April 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Claim(s) discussed: All generally .

Identification of prior art discussed: Sheth, Rousseau, and the eight references cited by the examiner in the Advisory Action of paper number 11 .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued the the combination set forth by the examiner would not have been obvious because it is undesirable to add an electrostatic charge to hydrophilic fibers. Applicant presented the opinion of a expert in the art stating the reasons why the skilled artisan would not have been motivated to make such a combination. The examiner suggested providing this reasoning in a 132 affidavit as evidence of nonobviousness.

Applicant argues that POLYBOND is a generic term used to refer to multiple types of materials, wherein some of these materials do not contain a telomer. However, the examiner pointed out that appilcant's specification teaches the use of the generic material POLYBOND and no evidence has been proffered showing that the majority of the materials known as POLYBOND do not contain a telomer.

Applicant's IDS will be considered upon reciept of a RCE or CPA. .